REMARKS

Applicants reply to the Advisory Action dated July 28, 2010 and further and further reply to the final Office Action dated May 18, 2010, after entry of the RCE. Support for the amendments may be found in the originally-filed specification, claims, and figures. No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Applicants assert that the application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration of the pending claims is requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner maintains his rationale for rejecting independent claims 1 and 28-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fiascone (U.S. Patent Application No. 2005/0114239), Tkaczyk (U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0059597), Lyons (U.S. Patent No. 5,189,608), and Admitted Prior Art (Applicants' Specification) in view of Bissonett (U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/0051917). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's rationale; however, Applicants amend certain claims, without prejudice or disclaimer, to further clarify the patentable aspects and to expedite prosecution.

Applicants do not concede that Fiascone is indeed prior art with respect to this application and Applicants reserve the option to antedate Fiascone, because Fiascone has a filing date of November 24, 2003 and the present application has a filing date of December 15, 2003.

Nonetheless, Applicants maintain that Fiascone is limited to a system which collects data from various sources, and then compiles the data together at the central collection point in a common data format. Once the data is in a common format, the data can be compared based on a user selected parameter. However, **Fiascone does not disclose or contemplate capturing and converting the data at the remote cite. Fiascone also fails to disclose a customization tool which is configured to allow an operator at a remote site to customize a standardized template. Fiascone does not disclose a system configured to consolidate data from a standardized template and data from a customized template into a master data format. Moreover, the system of Fiascone does not analyze, or classify un-reconciled data.**

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner notes "the each of the exchanges and/or brokerage houses store and transmit data in different formats respectively, to the format module." Applicants respectfully submit that an embodiment of the presently claimed invention includes the data being processed at the remote site, which, in the context of Fiascone, would be the exchange. However,

according to Fiascone and as the Examiner stated, the exchange simply transmits the exchange data. Put another way, there is no processing at the exchange. In this way, Fiascone is suitable for reconciliation of data between disparate parties (e.g. a brokerage house and an exchange). However, in the context of related parties, partitioning the conversion of data to remote sites provides more efficient use of resources and provides for faster reconciliation of the party's master financial data.

Tkaczyk discloses a system to create a plurality of standardized templates for inputting CS (clinical study) data, but not for converting or transforming the data from one format to another. As such, Tkaczyk **teaches away** from the presently claimed invention, by requiring that the data be initially inputted in a format that is consistent with a master data format, so that when records are compiled with the master data, the data is able to be integrated into the master data without conversion or processing. Tkaczyk does not disclose a system configured to consolidate a data from a standardized template and data from a customized template into a master data format. As such, Applicants assert that Tkaczyk and Fiascone may not be suitable to be considered in view of one another. **Significantly, imposing the format of Tkaczyk on the system of Fiascone would require that each exchange maintain a separate financial capture system for each brokerage, or would impose a system where all brokerages and all exchanges operate with the same financial capture system. This would eliminate the need for format module 110 as described in Fiascone, and similarly teaches away from the presently claimed invention.** Moreover, in the Specification, Applicants note that:

> [t]he global reconciliation tool was developed to address the problem of reconciliations being performed among various corporate departments using disparate computer accounting systems. Typically, responses to various technology implementation requests from these departments would have resulted in numerous disparate enhancements to each of the departments systems, thus forcing the systems to evolve in increasingly different directions. This in turn would lead to further complications in handling reconciliations among the departments.[1]

In other words, by combining the systems of Fiascone and Tkaczyk, *the Examiner is creating the system that the presently claimed invention was designed to avoid.*

Additionally, like Fiascone, Tkaczyk does not disclose or contemplate a customization tool which is configured to allow an operator at a remote site to customize a standardized template.

Tkaczyk requires that the customization be completed at the central system. Specifically, Tkaczyk recites:

> [i]n one embodiment, supervisor workstation 56 also enables the supervisor to create a plurality of standardized templates stored in database 20 within CRCS 22. The plurality of standardized templates are used for inputting CS data for a clinical study. In one embodiment, each of the plurality of standardized templates may be reconfigured by the supervisor to prompt a user to enter a variety of information as needed for a specific clinical study.[2]

Lyons discloses a system for standardizing the financial information accounting systems of an organization. However, the system does not provide for capturing data at a remote terminal or for identifying and analyzing un-reconciled data. Moreover, like Fiascone and Tkaczyk, Lyons does not disclose or contemplate a customization tool which is configured to allow an operator at a remote site to customize a standardized template. Additionally, Lyons does not disclose a system configured to consolidate data from a standardized template and data from a customized template into a master data format.

As such, Applicants assert that the cited references, alone or in combination, do not disclose or contemplate at least, "transmitting, by a computer based system for managing financial data, a standardized template for capturing remote financial data and a customization tool to a plurality of remote terminals, wherein the standardized template is operable on a plurality of operating systems, wherein the standardized template is customized with the customization tool to create a customized template for at least one of the remote terminals, **wherein the customized template is created at the remote terminal, and wherein at least one of the standardized template and the customized template is associated with a financial data system at each of the remote terminals,**" "transmitting, by the computer based system, a request for financial data to the plurality of remote terminals, **wherein each of the remote terminals extracts data from the financial data system to at least one the standardized template and the customized template in response to the request for financial data,**" "receiving, by the computer based system, the remote financial data from the plurality of remote terminals via the standardized template and the customized template, wherein the data contained in the standardized template is contained within a first format, wherein data from each of the remote terminals is extracted to at least one of the standardized temple and the customized template at each of the remote terminals, and wherein a first remote

---

[1] Specification, Paragraph 0016

terminal stores remote financial data in a second format which is receivable by the standardized template, and wherein a second remote terminal stores remote financial data in a third format which is receivable by the customized template, **and wherein the standardized template is configured to convert the remote financial data from the second format to the first format at the first remote terminal and the customized template is configured to convert the remote financial data from a third format to the first format a t the second remote terminal**" or "matching, by the computer based system, the remote financial data from the standardized template and the customized template to master financial data based on a set of predetermined rules, wherein the master financial data is stored in a first format " (emphasis added) as similarly recited in independent claims 1, 28, and 29.

Furthermore, claims 2-3, 6-9, 11-12, 26-27 and 30 variously depend from independent claim 1. As such, Applicants assert that claims 2-3, 6-9, 11-12, 26-27 and 30 are differentiated from the cited references for the same reasons as set forth above, in addition to their own novel features. Thus, Applicants respectfully request allowance of all pending claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. **19-2814**. If an extension of time is necessary, please accept this as a petition therefore. Applicants invite the Office to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner has any questions regarding this Reply or the present application in general.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 13, 2010   By: _____
                                    Mark Williams
                                    Reg. No. 64,425

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
400 E. Van Buren
One Arizona Center
Phoenix, Arizona 85004
Phone: 602-382-6542
Fax: 602-382-6070
Email: mwilliams@swlaw.com

---

[2] Tkaczyk, Paragraph 0026